

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: How much time do I have left?

PRESIDENT MOUL: You have five minutes left.

SENATOR MOORE: Thank you, Madam President and members. You know, Senator Hall briefly outlined a plan that was coming before us. As I mentioned, this amendment was one that I drafted, actually I drafted it on General File, and refiled it here on Select File, and after we go through the myriad of plans and ideas on this, and I know there are many others after this, I still, at this point in time, am going to move forward with this amendment, because I still think it is probably, for a variety of reasons, is something I certainly would endorse and I think that many members of the body can live with. And I don't know if I have 5 votes, 15, 25, 30, or zero, 1, I guess I have one, I know I have mine. But other than that, any time you talk about a variety of these things, you have to look at it in context of the overall picture, and I think you realize that there is going to be an ongoing argument, is this going to be a temporary tax or a permanent tax? And I guess my argument is, particularly now with the constitutional amendment entering the foray, I would, you know, hopefully, from my point of view at least, we can put some of the personal property tax back on the tax rolls if the constitutional amendment passes. But if it does not, I guess it is certainly my observation this body will go the route of exempting all personal property. And if, indeed, we do that, the taxes we are talking about raising here are not temporary but, indeed, are going to be permanent. And that is why I think, particularly the sales tax on services, that may be something we should look at permanent in the long term, when we review the long-term tax situation. I don't think you should try and sell it as a temporary tax. Now when you go, the other option you have is to not fully fund this proposal and pass it on to the property taxpayer and, obviously, myself being of the opinion for a variety of years that I've been consistent in trying to shift the burden of taxes in this state from property to sales and/or income, I don't think that is the prudent course either. Now there has been a variety of, starting with the Governor's original plan, where you did not reimburse local subdivisions. You did some sort of homestead exemption or some sort of rebate, a variety of ways, and the more I look at those, the more it seemed like we were changing paper three or four times that accomplishes the same goal. I